arXiv:1611.08293v1 [math.ST] 24 Nov 2016

Global Testing Against Sparse Alternatives under Ising Models

Rajarshi Mukherjee*, Sumit Mukherjee†, and Ming Yuan‡

Stanford University, Columbia University, and University of Wisconsin

(November 28, 2016)

Abstract

In this paper, we study the effect of dependence on detecting sparse signals. In particular, we focus on global testing against sparse alternatives for the means of binary outcomes following an Ising model, and establish how the interplay between the strength and sparsity of a signal determines its detectability under various notions of dependence. The profound impact of dependence is best illustrated under the Curie-Weiss model where we observe the effect of a "thermodynamic" phase transition. In particular, the critical state exhibits a subtle "blessing of dependence" phenomenon in that one can detect much weaker signals at criticality than otherwise. Furthermore, we develop a testing procedure that is broadly applicable to account for dependence and show that it is asymptotically minimax optimal under fairly general regularity conditions.

*Departments of Statistics, Stanford University.

†Departments of Statistics, Columbia University.

‡Morgridge Institute for Research and Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1300 University Avenue, Madison, WI 53706. The research and Ming Yuan was supported in part by NSF FRG Grant DMS-1265202, and NIH Grant 1-U54AI117924-01.

1 Introduction

Motivated by applications in a multitude of scientific disciplines, statistical analysis of "sparse signals" in a high dimensional setting, be it large-scale multiple testing or screening for relevant features, has drawn considerable attention in recent years. For more discussions on sparse signal detection type problems see, e.g., Donoho and Jin (2004); Arias-Castro et al. (2005, 2008); Addario-Berry et al. (2010); Hall and Jin (2010); Ingster et al. (2010); Cai and Yuan (2014); Arias-Castro and Wang (2015); Mukherjee et al. (2015), and references therein. A critical assumption often made in these studies is that the observations are independent. Recognizing the potential limitation of this assumption, several recent attempts have been made to understand the implications of dependence in both theory and methodology. See, e.g., Hall and Jin (2008, 2010); Arias-Castro et al. (2011); Wu et al. (2014); Jin and Ke (2014). These earlier efforts, setting in the context of Gaussian sequence or regression models, show that it is important to account for dependence among observations, and under suitable conditions, doing so appropriately may lead to tests that are as powerful as if the observations were independent. However, it remains largely unknown how the dependence may affect our ability to detect sparse signals beyond Gaussian models. The main goal of the present work is to fill in this void. In particular, we investigate the effect of dependence on detection of sparse signals for Bernoulli sequences, a class of problems arising naturally in many genomics applications (e.g., Mukherjee et al., 2015).

Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)^\top \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ be a random vector such that $\mathbb{P}(X_i = +1) = p_i$. In a canonical multiple testing setup, we want to test collectively that $H_0 : p_i = 1/2$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Of particular interest here is the setting when X_i's may be dependent. A general framework to capture the dependence among a sequence of binary random variables is the so-called Ising models, which have been studied extensively in the literature (Ising, 1925; Onsager, 1944; Ellis and Newman, 1978; Majewski et al., 2001; Stauffer, 2008; Mezard and Montanari, 2009). An Ising model specifies the joint distribution of $\mathbf{X}$ as:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu})} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{x}\right), \qquad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ is an $n \times n$ symmetric and hollow matrix, $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $Z(\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ is a normalizing constant. Throughout the rest of the paper, the expectation operator corresponding to (1) will be analogously denoted by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. It is clear that the matrix $\mathbf{Q}$

characterizes the dependence among the coordinates of $\mathbf{X}$, and X_i's are independent if $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{0}$. Under model (1), the relevant null hypothesis can be expressed as $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$. More specifically, we are interested in testing it against a sparse alternative:

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Xi(s, B), \tag{2}$$

where

$$\Xi(s, B) := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})| = s, \text{ and } \min_{i \in \mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \mu_i \geq B > 0 \right\},$$

and

$$\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) := \{1 \leq i \leq n : \mu_i \neq 0\}.$$

Our goal here is to study the impact of $\mathbf{Q}$ in doing so.

To this end, we adopt an asymptotic minimax framework that can be traced back at least to Burnashev (1979); Ingster (1994, 1998). See Ingster and Suslina (2003) for further discussions. Let a statistical test for H_0 versus H_1 be a measurable $\{0, 1\}$ valued function of the data $\mathbf{X}$, with 1 indicating rejecting the null hypothesis H_0 and 0 otherwise. The worst case risk of a test $T : \{\pm 1\}^n \to \{0, 1\}$ can be given by

$$\mathrm{Risk}(T, \Xi(s, B), \mathbf{Q}) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}} \left(T(\mathbf{X}) = 1 \right) + \sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Xi(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}} \left(T(\mathbf{X}) = 0 \right), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ denotes the probability measure as specified by (1). We say that a sequence of tests T indexed by n corresponding to a sequence of model-problem pair (1) and (3), to be asymptotically powerful (respectively asymptotically not powerful) against $\Xi(s, B)$ if

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{Risk}(T, \Xi(s, B), \mathbf{Q}) = 0 \text{ (respectively } \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{Risk}(T, \Xi(s, B), \mathbf{Q}) > 0). \tag{4}$$

The goal of the current paper is to characterize how the sparsity s and strength B of the signal ($\boldsymbol{\mu}$) jointly determine if there is a powerful test, and how the behavior changes with $\mathbf{Q}$. In particular,

- for a general class of Ising models, we provide tests for detecting arbitrary sparse signals and show that they are asymptotically rate optimal for Ising models on regular graphs in the high temperature regime;
- for Ising models on a the cycle graph, we establish rate optimal results for all regimes of temperature, and show that the detection thresholds are the same as the independent case;

- for the Curie-Weiss model (Kac, 1969; Nishimori, 2001), we provide sharp asymptotic detection thresholds for detecting arbitrarily sparse signals, which reveal an interesting phenomenon at the thermodynamic phase transition point of a Curie-Weiss magnet.

Our tools for analyzing the rate optimal tests depend on the method of exchangeable pairs (Chatterjee, 2007), which might be of independent interest.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we study in detail the optimal detection thresholds for the Curie-Weiss model and explore the effects of the presence of a "thermodynamic phase transition" in the model. Section 3 is devoted to develop and analyze testing procedures in the context of more general Ising models where we also show that under some conditions on $\mathbf{Q}$, the proposed testing procedure is indeed asymptotically optimal. Finally we conclude with some discussions in Section 4. The proof of the main results is relegated to Section 5.

2 Sparse Testing under Curie-Weiss Model

In most statistical problems, dependence reduces effective sample size and therefore makes inference harder. This, however, turns out not necessarily to be the case in our setting. The effect of dependence on sparse testing under Ising model is more profound. To make this more clear we first consider one of the most popular examples of Ising models, namely the Curie-Weiss model. In the Curie-Weiss model,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{Z(\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu})}\exp\left(\frac{\theta}{n}\sum_{1\le i<j\le n} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i x_i\right), \tag{5}$$

where in this section, with slight abuse of notation, we rename $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, and $Z(\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ by $\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $Z(\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu})$ respectively, for brevity. The Curie-Weiss model is deceivingly simple and one of the classical examples that exhibit the so-called "thermodynamic" phase transition at $\theta = 1$. See, e.g., Kac (1969); Nishimori (2001). It turns out that such a phase transition directly impacts how well a sparse signal can be detected. Following the convention, we shall refer to $\theta = 1$ as the critical state, $\theta > 1$ the low temperature states and $\theta < 1$ the high temperature states.

2.1 High temperature states

We consider first the high temperature case i.e. $0 \leq \theta < 1$. It is instructive to begin with the case when $\theta = 0$, that is, $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent Bernoulli random variables. By Central Limit Theorem

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\bar{X} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\tanh(\mu_i)\right) \to_d N\left(0, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{sech}^2(\mu_i)\right),$$

where

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i.$$

In particular, under the null hypothesis,

$$\sqrt{n}\bar{X} \to_d N(0,1).$$

This immediately suggests a test that rejects H_0 if and only $\sqrt{n}\bar{X} \geq L_n$ for a diverging sequence $L_n = o(n^{-1/2}s\tanh(B))$ is asymptotic powerful, in the sense of (4), for testing (2) whenever $s\tanh(B) \gg n^{1/2}$. This turns out to be the best one can do in that there is no powerful test for testing (2) if $s\tanh(B) = O(n^{1/2})$. See, e.g., Mukherjee et al. (2015). An immediate question of interest is what happens if there is dependence, that is $0 < \theta < 1$. This is answered by Theorem 1 below.

Theorem 1. *Consider testing* (2) *based on* $\mathbf{X}$ *following the Curie-Weiss model (5) with* $0 \leq \theta < 1$. *If* $s\tanh(B) \gg n^{1/2}$, *then the test that rejects* H_0 *if and only if* $\sqrt{n}\bar{X} \geq L_n$ *for a diverging* L_n *such that* $L_n = o(n^{-1/2}s\tanh(B))$ *is asymptotically powerful for* (2). *Conversely, if* $s\tanh(B) = O(n^{1/2})$, *then there is no asymptotically powerful test for* (2).

Theorem 1 shows that, under high temperature states, the sparse testing problem (2) behaves similarly to the independent case. Not only the detection limit remains the same, but also it can be attained even if one neglects the dependence while constructing the test.

2.2 Low temperature states

Now consider the low temperature case when $\theta > 1$. The naïve test that rejects H_0 whenever $\sqrt{n}\bar{X} \geq L_n$ is no longer asymptotically powerful in these situations. In particular, $\bar{X}$ concentrates around the roots of $x = \tanh(\theta x)$ and $\sqrt{n}\bar{X}$ is larger than any $L_n = O(n^{1/2})$ with

a non-vanishing probability, which results in an asymptotically strictly positive probability of Type I error for a test based on rejecting H_0 if $\sqrt{n}\bar{X} \geq L_n$.

To overcome this difficulty, we shall consider a slightly modified test statistic:

$$\tilde{X} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[X_i - \tanh\left(\frac{\theta}{n}\sum_{j\neq i} X_j\right)\right],$$

Note that

$$\tanh\left(\frac{\theta}{n}\sum_{j\neq i} X_j\right) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta,\mathbf{0}}(X_i | X_j : j \neq i)$$

is the conditional mean of X_i given $\{X_j : j \neq i\}$ under the Curie-Weiss model with $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$. In other words, we average after centering each observation X_i by its conditional mean, instead of the unconditional mean, under H_0. We can then proceed to reject H_0 if and only if $\sqrt{n}\tilde{X} \geq L_n$. The next theorem shows that this procedure is indeed optimal with appropriate choice of L_n.

Theorem 2. *Consider testing* (2) *based on* $\mathbf{X}$ *following the Curie-Weiss model (5) with* $\theta > 1$. *If* $s\tanh(B) \gg n^{1/2}$, *then the test that rejects* H_0 *if and only if* $\sqrt{n}\tilde{X} \geq L_n$ *for a diverging* L_n *such that* $L_n = o(n^{-1/2}s\tanh(B))$ *is asymptotically powerful for* (2). *Conversely, if* $s\tanh(B) = O(n^{1/2})$, *then there is no asymptotically powerful test for* (2).

Theorem 2 shows that the detection limits for low temperature states remain the same as that for high temperature states, but a different test is required to achieve it.

2.3 Critical state

The situation however changes at the critical state $\theta = 1$, where a much weaker signal could still be detected. This is made precise by our next theorem, where we show that detection thresholds, in terms of $s\tanh(B)$, for the corresponding Curie-Weiss model at criticality scales as $n^{-3/4}$ instead of $n^{-1/2}$ as in either low or high temperature states. Moreover, it is attainable by the test that rejects H_0 whenever $n^{1/4}\bar{X} \geq L_n$ for appropriately chosen L_n.

Theorem 3. *Consider testing* (2) *based on* $\mathbf{X}$ *following the Curie-Weiss model (5) with* $\theta = 1$. *If* $s\tanh(B) \gg n^{1/4}$, *then a test that rejects* H_0 *if and only if* $n^{1/4}\bar{X} \geq L_n$ *for a suitably chosen diverging sequence* L_n, *is asymptotically powerful for* (2). *Conversely, if* $s\tanh(B) = O(n^{1/4})$, *then there is no asymptotically powerful test for* (2).

A few comments are in order about the implications of Theorem 3 in contrast to Theorem 1 and 2. Previously, the distributional limits for the total magnetization $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ has been characterized in all the three regimes of high ($\theta < 1$), low ($\theta > 1$), and critical ($\theta = 1$) temperatures (Ellis and Newman, 1978) when $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$. Our results demonstrate parallel behavior in terms of detection of sparse external magnetization $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Interestingly, both below and above phase transition the detection problem considered here behaves similar to that in a disordered system of i.i.d. random variables, in spite having different asymptotic behavior of the total magnetization in the two regimes. However, an interesting phenomenon continues to emerge at $\theta = 1$ where one can detect a much smaller signal or external magnetization (magnitude of $s \tanh(B)$). In particular, according to Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, no signal is detectable of sparsity $s \ll \sqrt{n}$, when $\theta \neq 1$. In contrast, Theorem 3 establishes signals satisfying $s \tanh(B) \gg n^{1/4}$ is detectable for $n^{1/4} \lesssim s \ll \sqrt{n}$, where $a_n \lesssim b_n$ means $a_n = O(b_n)$. As mentioned before, it is well known the Curie-Weiss model undergoes a phase transition at $\theta = 1$. Theorem 3 provides a rigorous verification of the fact that the phase transition point $\theta = 1$ can reflect itself in terms of detection problems, even though θ is a nuisance parameter. In particular, the detection is easier than at non-criticality. This is interesting in its own right since the concentration of $\bar{X}$ under the null hypothesis is weaker than that for $\theta < 1$ (Chatterjee et al., 2010) and yet a smaller amount of signal enables us to break free of the null fluctuations. We shall make this phenomenon more transparent in the proof of the theorem.

3 Sparse Testing under General Ising Models

As we can see from the previous section, the effect of dependence on sparse testing under Ising models is more subtle than the Gaussian case. It is of interest to investigate to what extent the behavior we observed for the Curie-Weiss model applies to the more general Ising model, and whether there is a more broadly applicable strategy to deal with the general dependence structure. To this end, we further explore the idea of centering by the conditional mean we employed to treat low temperature states under Curie-Weiss model, and argue that it indeed works under fairly general situations.

3.1 Conditional mean centered tests

Note that under the Ising model (1),

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}(X_i|X_j : j \neq i) = \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))$$

where

$$m_i(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} Q_{ij}X_j.$$

Following the same idea as before, we shall consider a test statistic

$$\tilde{X} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}[X_i - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))],$$

and proceed to reject H_0 if and only if $\sqrt{n}\tilde{X} \geq L_n$. The following result shows that the same detection limit $s\tanh(B) \gg n^{1/2}$ can be achieved by this test as long as $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = O_p(1)$, where $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_p \to \ell_q} = \max_{\|x\|_{\ell_p} \leq 1} \|\mathbf{Q}x\|_{\ell_q}$ for $p, q > 0$.

Theorem 4. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *follow an Ising model* (1) *with* $\mathbf{Q}$ *such that* $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = O_p(1)$. *Consider testing hypotheses about* $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ *as described by* (2). *If* $s\tanh(B) \gg n^{1/2}$, *then the test that rejects* H_0 *if and only if* $\sqrt{n}\tilde{X} \geq L_n$ *for any* $L_n \to \infty$ *such that* $L_n = o(n^{-1/2}s\tanh(B))$ *is asymptotically powerful.*

The condition $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = O_p(1)$ can be viewed as a way to describe high temperature states in general. It holds for many common examples of the Ising model in the literature. In particular, $\mathbf{Q}$ oftentimes can be associated with a certain graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with vertex set $V = [n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and edge set $E \subseteq [n] \times [n]$ so that $\mathbf{Q} = (n\theta)G/(2|E|)$, where G is the adjacency matrix for $\mathcal{G}$, $|E|$ is the cardinality of E, and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a parameter independent of n deciding the degree of dependence in the spin-system. Below we provide several more specific examples that are commonly studied in the literature.

Dense Graphs: Recall that

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |Q_{ij}| \leq \frac{n^2|\theta|}{2|E|}.$$

If the dependence structure is guided by densely labeled graphs so that $|E| = \Theta(n^2)$, then $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = O_p(1)$.

Regular Graphs: When the dependence structure is guided by a regular graph of degree d_n, we can write $\mathbf{Q} = \theta G/d_n$. Therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = \max_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |Q_{ij}| = \frac{|\theta|}{d_n} \cdot d_n = |\theta|,$$

and again obeying the condition $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = O_p(1)$.

Erdös-Rényi Graphs: Another example is the Erdös-Rényi graph where an edge between each pair of nodes is present with probability p_n independent of each other. It is not hard to derive from Chernoff bound and union bounds that the maximum degree $d_{\max}$ and the totally number of edges $|E|$ of an Erdös-Rényi graph satisfy with high probability:

$$d_{\max} \le np_n(1+\delta), \qquad \text{and} \qquad |E| \ge \frac{n(n-1)}{2} p_n \cdot (1-\delta)$$

for any $\delta \in (0,1)$, provided that $np_n \gg \log n$. This immediately implies that $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = O_p(1)$.

In other words, the detection limit established in Theorem 4 applies to all these types of Ising models. In particular, it suggests that, under Curie-Weiss model, the $\sqrt{n}\tilde{X}$ based test can detect sparse external magnetization $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Xi(s, B)$ if $s \tanh(B) \gg n^{1/2}$, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, which, in the light of Theorems 1 and 2, is optimal in both high and low temperature states.

3.2 Optimality

The detection limit presented in Theorem 4 matches those obtained for independent Bernoulli sequence model. It is of interest to understand to what extent the upper bounds in Theorem 4 are sharp. The answer to this question might be subtle. In particular, as we see in the Curie-Weiss case, the optimal rates of detection thresholds depend on the presence of thermodynamic phase transition in the null model. To further illustrate the role of criticality, we now consider an example of the Ising model without phase transition and the corresponding behavior of the detection problem (2) in that case. Let

$$\mathbf{Q}_{i,j} = \frac{\theta}{2} \mathbb{I}\{|i-j| = 1 \mod n\}$$

so that the corresponding Ising model can be identified with a cycle graph of length n. Our next result shows that the detection threshold remains the same for any θ, and is the same as the independent case i.e. $\theta = 0$.

Theorem 5. *Suppose* $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$*, where* $\mathbf{Q}$ *is the scaled adjancency matrix of the cycle graph of length* n*, that is,* $\mathbf{Q}_{i,j} = \frac{\theta}{2} 1\{|i-j| = 1 \mod n\}$ *for some* $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$*. If* $s \tanh(B) \leq C\sqrt{n}$ *for some* $C > 0$*, then no test is asymptotically powerful for the testing problem (2).*

In view of Theorem 4, if $s \tanh(B) \gg n^{1/2}$, then the test that rejects H_0 if and only if $\sqrt{n}\tilde{X} \geq L_n$ for any $L_n \to \infty$ such that $L_n = o(n^{-1/2} s \tanh(B))$ is asymptotically powerful for the testing problem (2). Together with Theorem 5, this shows that for the Ising model on the cycle graph of length n, which is a physical model without thermodynamic phase transitions, the detection thresholds mirror those obtained in independent Bernoulli sequence problems (Mukherjee et al., 2015).

The difference between these results and those for the Curie-Weiss model demonstrates the difficulty of a unified and complete treatment to general Ising models. We offer here, instead, a partial answer and show that the test described earlier in the section (Theorem 4) is indeed optimal under fairly general weak dependence for reasonably regular graphs.

Theorem 6. *Suppose* $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ *as in* (1) *and consider testing hypotheses about* $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ *as described by* (2)*. Assume* $\mathbf{Q}_{i,j} \geq 0$ *for all* (i,j) *such that* $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} \leq \rho < 1$ *for some constant* $\rho > 0$*,* $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = O(\sqrt{n})$*, and*

$$\left\| \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} \right\|^2 = O(1).$$

If $s \tanh(B) \leq C\sqrt{n}$ *for some constant* $C > 0$*, then no test is asymptotically powerful for* (2)*.*

Theorem 6 provides rate optimal lower bound to certain instances pertaining to Theorem 4. One essential feature of Theorem 6 is the implied impossibility result for the $s \ll \sqrt{n}$ regime. More precisely, irrespective of signal strength, no tests are asymptotically powerful when the number of signals drop below $\sqrt{n}$ in asymptotic order. This is once again in parallel to results in Mukherjee et al. (2015), and provides further evidence that low dependence/high temperature regimes (as encoded by $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} \leq \rho < 1$) resemble independent Bernoulli ensembles. Theorem 6 immediately implies the optimality of the conditional mean centered tests for a couple of common examples.

High Degree Regular Graphs: When the dependence structure is guided by a regular graph, that is $\mathbf{Q} = \frac{\theta}{d_n} G_n$, it is clear that

$$\left\| \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} \right\|^2 = 0.$$

If $0 \le \theta < 1$ and $d_n \gtrsim \sqrt{n}$, then one can easily verify the conditions of Theorem 6 since

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = \theta < 1, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = n\theta^2/d_n.$$

Dense Erdös-Rényi Graphs: When the dependence structure is guided by a Erdös-Rényi graph on n vertices with parameter p_n, that is $\mathbf{Q} = \theta/(np_n)G_n$ with $G_n(i,j) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_n)$ independently for all $1 \le i < j \le n$, we can also verify that the conditions of Theorem 6 holds with probability tending to one if $0 \le \theta < 1$ and p_n bounded away from 0. As before, by Chernoff bounds, we can easily derive that with probability tending to one,

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty} = \theta \frac{d_{\max}}{np_n} \le \frac{\theta(1+\delta)np_n}{np_n} = \theta(1+\delta),$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = \frac{\theta^2}{n^2 p_n^2} \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} G_n(i,j) \le \frac{\theta^2(1+\delta)n(n-1)p_n}{2n^2p_n^2} \le \frac{\theta^2}{2p_n}(1+\delta),$$

for any $\delta > 0$. Finally, denote by d_i the degree of the ith node, then

$$\left\| \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} \right\|^2 = \frac{\theta^2}{n^2p_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(d_i - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n d_j \right)^2 \le \frac{\theta^2}{n^2p_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(d_i - (n-1)p_n \right)^2 = O_p(1),$$

by Markov inequality and the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(d_i - (n-1)p_n \right)^2 \right] = n^2 p_n (1-p_n).$$

4 Discussions

In this paper we study the asymptotic minimax rates of detection for arbitrary sparse signals in Ising Models, considered as a framework to study dependency structures in binary outcomes. We show that the detection thresholds in Ising models might depend on the

presence of a "thermodynamic" phase transition in the model. In the context of a Curie-Weiss Ising model, the presence of such a phase transition results in substantial faster rates of detection of sparse signals at criticality. On the other hand, lack of such phase transitions, in the Ising model on the line graph, yields results parallel to those in independent Bernoulli sequence models, irrespective of the level of dependence. We further show that for ising models defined on graphs enjoying certain degree of regularity, detection thresholds parallel those in independent Bernoulli sequence models in the low dependence/high temperature regime. It will be highly interesting to consider other kinds of graphs left out by Theorem 6 in the context of proving matching lower bounds to Theorem 4. This seems highly challenging and might depend heavily on the sharp asymptotic behavior of the partition function of more general Ising model under low-magnetization regimes. The issue of unknown dependency structure $\mathbf{Q}$, and especially the estimation of unknown temperature parameter θ for Ising models defined on given underlying graphs, is also subtle since as shown in Bhattacharya and Mukherjee (2015). In particular, existence of a consistent estimator of θ under the null model (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\mu} = 0$) depends crucially on the position of θ with respect to the point of criticality and in particular high temperature regimes (i.e. low positive values of θ) precludes the existence of any consistent estimator. The situation becomes even more complicated in presence of external magnetization (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\mu} \neq 0$). Finally, this paper opens up several interesting avenues of future research. In particular, investigating the effect of dependence on detection of segment type structured signals deserves special attention.

5 Proof of Main Results

In this section we collect the proofs of our main results. It is convenient to first prove the general results, namely the upper bound given by Theorem 4 and lower bound by Theorem 6, and then consider the special cases of the Ising model on a cycle graph, and Curie-Weiss model.

5.1 Proof of Theorem 4

The key to the proof is the tail behavior of

$$f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[X_i - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i|X_j : j \neq i)\right] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[X_i - \tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j + \mu_j\right)\right],$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ means the expectation is taken with respect to the Ising model (1). In particular, we shall make use of the following concentration bound for $f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X})$.

Lemma 1. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *be a random vector following the Ising model* (1)*. Then for any* $t > 0$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(|f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X})| \geq t) \leq 2\exp\left\{-\frac{nt^2}{4\left(1 + \|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty\to\ell_\infty}\right)^2}\right\}.$$

Lemma 1 follows from a standard application of Stein's Method for concentration inequalities (Chatterjee, 2005, 2007; Chatterjee et al., 2010). We defer the detailed proof to the Appendix.

We are now in position to prove Theorem 4. We first consider the Type I error. By Lemma 1, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}(\sqrt{n}\tilde{X} \geq L_n) \leq 2\exp(-CL_n^2) \to 0.$$

It remains to consider the Type II error. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{X} - f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j + \mu_i\right) - \tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})}\left[\tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j + \mu_i\right) - \tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j\right)\right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})}\left[\tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j + B\right) - \tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j\right)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the monotonicity of tanh.

Observe that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y > 0$,

$$\tanh(x+y) - \tanh(x) = \frac{[1-\tanh^2(x)]\tanh(y)}{1+\tanh(x)\tanh(y)} \geq [1-\tanh(x)]\tanh(y), \tag{6}$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $|\tanh(x)| \leq 1$. Thus,

$$\tilde{X} - f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) \geq \frac{\tanh(B)}{n}\sum_{i\in\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j\right)\right].$$

Because

$$\sum_{j\neq i} \mathbf{Q}_{ij} X_j \leq \|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty},$$

we get

$$\tilde{X} - f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) \geq \frac{s\tanh(B)}{n}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty}\right)\right].$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{n}\tilde{X} - \sqrt{n} f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) \geq \frac{s\tanh(B)}{\sqrt{n}}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty}\right)\right] \gg L_n.$$

This, together with another application of Lemma 1, yields the desired claim.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 6

The proof is somewhat lengthy and we break it into several steps.

5.2.1 Reduction to magnetization

We first show that a lower bound can be characterizing the behavior of $\bar{X}$ under the alternative. To this end, note that for any test T and a distribution π over $\Xi(s,B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Risk}(T, \Xi_{s,B}, \mathbf{Q}) &= \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(T(\mathbf{X}) = 1\right) + \sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\Xi(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(T(\mathbf{X}) = 0\right) \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(T(\mathbf{X}) = 1\right) + \int \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(T(\mathbf{X}) = 0\right) d\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}).
\end{aligned}$$

The rightmost hand side is exactly the risk when testing H_0 against a simple alternative where $\mathbf{X}$ follows a mixture distribution:

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) := \int \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\right) d\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu})$$

By Neymann-Pearson Lemma, this can be further lower bounded by

$$\mathrm{Risk}(T, \Xi(s,B), \mathbf{Q}) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(L_\pi(\mathbf{X}) > 1\right) + \int \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(L_\pi(\mathbf{X}) \leq 1\right) d\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}),$$

where

$$L_\pi(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_\pi(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}(\mathbf{X})}$$

is the likelihood ratio.

We can now choose a particular prior distribution π to make L_π a monotone function of $\bar{X}$. To this end, let π be supported over

$$\widetilde{\Xi}(s, B) = \{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \{0, B\}^n : |\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})| = s\},$$

so that

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \propto Z(\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \widetilde{\Xi}(s, B).$$

It is not hard to derive that, with this particular choice,

$$L_\pi(\mathbf{X}) \propto \sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \widetilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \exp(\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E}_S \exp\left(B \sum_{i \in S} X_i\right),$$

where $\mathbb{E}_S$ means expectation over S, a uniformly sampled subset of $[n]$ of size s. It is clear, by symmetry, that the rightmost hand side is invariant to the permutation of the coordinates of $\mathbf{X}$. In addition, it is an increasing function of

$$|\{i \in [n] : X_i = 1\}| = \frac{1}{2}\left(n + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right),$$

and hence an increasing function of $\bar{X}$.

The observation that $L_\pi(\mathbf{X})$ is an increasing function of $\bar{X}$ implies that there exists a sequence of κ_ns such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Risk}(T, \Xi(s, B), \mathbf{Q}) &\geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(L_\pi(\mathbf{X}) > 1\right) + \int \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(L_\pi(\mathbf{X}) \leq 1\right) d\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > \kappa_n\right) + \int \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq \kappa_n\right) d\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > \kappa_n\right) + \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \widetilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq \kappa_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

It now remains to study the behavior of $\bar{X}$.

In particular, it suffices to show that, for any fixed $x > 0$,

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > x\sqrt{n}\right\} > 0, \tag{7}$$

and for any $x_n \to \infty$,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \widetilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > x_n\sqrt{n}\right) = 0. \tag{8}$$

Assuming (7) holds, then for any test T to be asymptotic powerful, we need $\kappa_n \gg \sqrt{n}$ to ensure that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i > \kappa_n\right\} \to 0.$$

But, in the light of (8), this choice necessarily leads to

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\tilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \leq \kappa_n\right\} \to 1,$$

so that

$$\mathrm{Risk}(T, \Xi(s,B), \mathbf{Q}) \to 1.$$

In other words, there is no asymptotic powerful test if both (7) and (8) hold. We now proceed to prove them separately.

5.2.2 Proof of (8):

Recall that $m_i(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{Q}_{ij} X_j$ and assume $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \tilde{\Xi}(s,B)$ with $s\tanh(B) \leq C\sqrt{n}$. Also let $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \ldots, r_n)^\top$ where $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{Q}) := \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1}$. We split the proof into two cases, depending on whether $B < 1$ or $B > 1$.

The case of $B \in [0,1]$: Write

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}[X_i - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i)] + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i) - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X})) - m_i(\mathbf{X})] + \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\mathbf{X}).\end{aligned}$$

Observe that,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{X} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i X_i = \rho^* \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(r_i - \rho_*)X_i,$$

where $\rho_* = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{r} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\rho_*)\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}[X_i - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i)] + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i) - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X})) - m_i(\mathbf{X})] + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(r_i - \rho_*)X_i. \\ &=: \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3 + \Delta_4.\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i > x_n\sqrt{n}\right\} \le \sum_{j=1}^{4} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\Delta_j > \frac{1}{4(1-\rho_*)} x_n\sqrt{n}\right\}.$$

We now argue that for any $x_n \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\widetilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\Delta_j > \frac{1}{4(1-\rho_*)} x_n\sqrt{n}\right\} \to 0, \qquad j = 1,\ldots,4. \tag{9}$$

The case for Δ_4 follows from our assumption ($\left\|\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1}\right\|^2 = O(1)$) upon Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The case Δ_1 follows immediately from Lemma 1. On the other hand, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} [\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i) - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))] &\le \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i) - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))| \\ &\le \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tanh(\mu_i) = s\tanh(B),\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the subadditivity of tanh. The bound (9) for Δ_2 then follows from the fact that $s\tanh(B) = O(\sqrt{n})$.

We now consider Δ_3. Recall that $|x - \tanh(x)| \le x^2$. It suffices to show that, as $x_n \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\widetilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i^2(\mathbf{X}) > \frac{1}{4} x_n\sqrt{n}\right\} \to 0, \tag{10}$$

which follows from Markov inequality and the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *be a random vector following the Ising model* (1)*. Assume that* $\mathbf{Q}_{i,j} \ge 0$ *for all* (i,j) *such that* $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty\to\ell_\infty} \le \rho$ *for some constant* $\rho < 1$*, and* $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = O(\sqrt{n})$*. Then for any fixed* $C > 0$*,*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in[0,1]^n:\\ \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \le C\sqrt{n}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\mathbf{X})^2\right) < \infty.$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is deferred to the Appendix.

The case of $B > 1$: In this case $s\tanh(B) \le C\sqrt{n}$ implies $s \le C'\sqrt{n}$, where $C' := C/\tanh(1)$. Also, since the statistic $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is stochastically non-decreasing in B, without loss of generality it suffices to show that, for a fixed $S \subset [n]$ obeying $|S| = s$,

$$\limsup_{K\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \limsup_{B\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\widetilde{\Xi}(s,B):\\ \mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})=S}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\sum_{i\in S^c} X_i > K\sqrt{n}\right\} = 0. \tag{11}$$

Now, for $i \in S$ we have for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \tilde{\Xi}(s, B)$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i = 1 | X_j = x_j, j \neq i) = \frac{e^{B+m_i(\mathbf{x})}}{e^{B+m_i(x)} + e^{-B-m_i(\mathbf{x})}} = \frac{1}{1+e^{-2m_i(\mathbf{x})-2B}} \geq \frac{1}{1+e^{2-2B}},$$

and so $\lim_{B\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i = 1, i \in S) = 1$ uniformly $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \tilde{\Xi}(s, B)$ with $s \leq C'\sqrt{n}$. Also note that for any configuration $(x_j, j \in S^c)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i = x_i, i \in S^c | X_i = 1, i \in S) \propto \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j\in S^c} x_i x_j \mathbf{Q}_{ij} + \sum_{i\in S^c} x_i \tilde{\mu}_{S,i}\right), \tag{12}$$

where $\tilde{\mu}_{S,i} := \sum_{j\in S} \mathbf{Q}_{ij} \leq \|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_\infty\to\ell_\infty} \leq \rho$. Further we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S,i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in S} \mathbf{Q}_{ij} = \sum_{j\in S}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Q}_{ij} \leq C'\rho\sqrt{n}. \tag{13}$$

We shall refer to the distribution in (12) as $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_S,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S}$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_S$ is the $(n-s)\times(n-s)$ principle matrix of $\mathbf{Q}$ by restricting the index in S^c. Therefore we simply need to verify that $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_S$ satisfy the conditions for $\mathbf{Q}$ in Theorem 6. Trivially $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{ij} \geq 0$ for all i, j and $\|\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\|_{\infty\to\infty} \leq \|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\infty\to\infty} \leq \rho$. For verifying the third condition, i.e.

$$\left\|\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{1}\right\|^2 = O(1),$$

note that

$$\begin{aligned}
O(1) = \left\|\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1}\right\|^2 =& \frac{1}{2n}\sum_{i,j=1}^n (r_i(\mathbf{Q}) - r_j(\mathbf{Q}))^2 \\
\geq& \frac{1}{2n}\sum_{i,j\in S^c} (r_i(\mathbf{Q}) - r_j(\mathbf{Q}))^2 \\
=& \frac{n-s}{n} \times \frac{1}{2(n-s)}\sum_{i,j\in S^c} (r_i(\mathbf{Q}) - r_j(\mathbf{Q}))^2 \\
\geq& \frac{n-s}{n}\left\|\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{1}\right\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore with $o_B(1)$ denoting a sequence of real umbers that converges to 0 uniformly over

$\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \tilde{\Xi}(s, B)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{B\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\tilde{\Xi}(s,B):\\ \mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})=S}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\sum_{i\in S^c} X_i > K\sqrt{n}\right\} \\
&\leq \limsup_{B\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\tilde{\Xi}(s,B):\\ \mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})=S}} \left\{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i\in S^c} X_i > K\sqrt{n} | X_j = 1, j\in S\right) + o_B(1)\right\} \\
&= \limsup_{B\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\tilde{\Xi}(s,B):\\ \mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})=S}} \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_S,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S}\left(\sum_{i\in S^c} X_i > K\sqrt{n}\right) \\
&\leq \sup_{S\subset[n]} \sup_{\substack{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S:\\ \sum_{i\in S^c}\tilde{\mu}_{S,i}\leq C'\rho\sqrt{n}}} \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_S,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S}\left(\sum_{i\in S^c} X_i > K\sqrt{n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (13). The proof of the claim (11) thereafter follows using the same argument as that for the case when $B < 1$.

5.2.3 Proof of (7):

It is clear that, by symmetry,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\Big(\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\Big| > K\sqrt{n}\Big) = 2\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > K\sqrt{n}\Big). \tag{14}$$

In establishing (8), we essentially proved that

$$\limsup_{K\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\tilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > K\sqrt{n}\right) = 0. \tag{15}$$

By choosing K large enough, we can make the right hand side of (14) less than $1/2$. This gives

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{-1,1\}^n} e^{\mathbf{x}^\top\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2} \leq 2\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in D_{n,K}} e^{\mathbf{x}^\top\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2}, \tag{16}$$

where $D_{n,K} := \left\{ |\sum_{i=1}^n X_i| \leq K\sqrt{n} \right\}$. Then, setting $C_n := \{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > \lambda\sqrt{n}\}$, for any $K > \lambda$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}(C_n) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}(C_n \cap D_{n,K}) =& \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in C_n\cap D_{n,K}} e^{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2}}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{-1,1\}^n} e^{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2}} \\
\geq& \frac{1}{2}\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in C_n\cap D_{n,K}} e^{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2}}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in D_{n,K}} e^{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2}} \\
\geq& \frac{e^{-2Kt}}{2}\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in C_n\cap D_{n,K}} e^{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2+\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in D_{n,K}} e^{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}/2}} \\
=& \frac{e^{-2Kt}}{2}\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}(C_n \cap D_{n,K})}{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}(D_{n,K})} \\
\geq& \frac{e^{-2Kt}}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}(C_n \cap D_{n,K})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}(t) = tn^{-1/2}\mathbf{1}$. To show (7), it thus suffices to show that there exists K large enough and $t > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}(C_n \cap D_{n,K}) > 0.$$

To this end, it suffices to show that for any $\lambda > 0$ there exists t such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > \lambda\sqrt{n}) > 0. \tag{17}$$

If (17) holds, then there exists $t > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}(C_n) > 0.$$

It now suffices to show that for any t fixed one has

$$\limsup_{K\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}(D_{n,K}^c) = 0,$$

which follows from (15).

It now remains to show (17). To begin, note that for $h > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)} X_i &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)} \tanh\left(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \frac{h}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)} \frac{\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X})) + \tanh\left(\frac{h}{\sqrt{n}}\right)}{1 + \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))\tanh\left(\frac{h}{\sqrt{n}}\right)} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)} \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X})) + \tanh\left(\frac{h}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\tanh\left(\frac{h}{\sqrt{n}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we use Holley inequality (e.g., Theorem 2.1 of Grimmett, 2006) for the two probability measures $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)}$ to conclude

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)} \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},0} \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X})) = 0,$$

in the light of (2.7) of Grimmett (2006). Adding over $1 \leq i \leq i$ gives

$$F_n'(h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}\tanh\left(\frac{h}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \tag{18}$$

where $F_n(h)$ is the log normalizing constant for the model $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(h)}$. Thus, using Markov's inequality one gets

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \leq \lambda\sqrt{n}\right) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}(t)}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i} \geq e^{-\lambda}\right) \leq \exp\left\{\lambda + F_n(t-1) - F_n(t)\right\},$$

Using (18), the exponent in the rightmost hand side can be estimated as

$$\lambda + F_n(t-1) - F_n(t) = \lambda - \int_{t-1}^{t} F_n'(h)dh \leq \lambda - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}\tanh\left(\frac{t-1}{\sqrt{n}}\right),$$

which is negative and uniformly bounded away from 0 for all n large. (17) now follows immediately with the choice $t = 4\lambda + 1$.

5.3 Proof of Theorem 5

We set $m_i(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{Q}_{ij} X_j$ and assume $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \tilde{\Xi}(s, B)$ with $s\tanh(B) \leq C\sqrt{n}$. By the same argument as that of Section 5.2.1, it suffices to show that there does not exist a sequence of positive reals $\{L_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i > L_n\right) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i < L_n\right) \to 0.$$

Suppose, to the contrary, that there exists such a sequence. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}} \exp\left\{\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i\right\} = \frac{Z\left(\mathbf{Q}, \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{1}\right)}{Z\left(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{0}\right)} = \lambda_1\left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n + \lambda_2\left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n,$$

where

$$\lambda_i(t) := \frac{e^{\theta}\cosh(t) + (-1)^{i+1}\sqrt{e^{2\theta}\sinh(t)^2 + e^{-2\theta}}}{e^{\theta} + e^{-\theta}}.$$

By a direct calculation we have

$$\lambda_1(0) = 1 > \lambda_2(0) = \tanh(\theta), \quad \lambda_1'(0) = \lambda_2'(0) = 0, \quad c(\theta) := \lambda_1''(0) > 0,$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}} e^{\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i} = \lambda_1\Big(\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)^n + \lambda_2\Big(\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)^n \overset{n\to\infty}{\to} e^{\frac{c(\theta)t^2}{2)}}.$$

This implies that under H_0

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \overset{d}{\to} N(0, c(\theta)),$$

which for any $\lambda > 0$ gives

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i > \lambda\sqrt{n}\right) > 0.$$

Therefore, $L_n \gg \sqrt{n}$. Now invoking Lemma 1, for any $K > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i)\right| > K\sqrt{n}\right\} \le 2e^{-K^2/12}.$$

On this set we have for a universal constant $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))\right| =& \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i))\right| \\ &+ \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i) - \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X})))\right| \\ \le& K\sqrt{n} + C\sum_{i=1}^{n}\tanh(\mu_i) \\ \le& K\sqrt{n} + Cs\tanh(B),\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i-\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X})))\right|>K\sqrt{n}+Cs\tanh(B)\right\}\leq 2e^{-K^2/12}. \tag{19}$$

Also, setting $g(t):=t/\theta-\tanh(t)$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i-\tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))=\sum_{i=1}^{n}g(m_i(\mathbf{X}))=\{Q_n(\mathbf{X})-R_n(\mathbf{X})\}g(\theta),$$

where

$$Q_n(\mathbf{X}):=\left|\{1\leq i\leq n: m_i(\mathbf{X})=\theta\}\right|,\quad R_n(\mathbf{X}):=\left|\{1\leq i\leq n: m_i(\mathbf{X})=-\theta\}\right|.$$

Indeed, this holds, as in this case $m_i(\mathbf{X})$ can take only three values $\{-\theta,0,\theta\}$, and $g(.)$ is an odd function. Thus using (19) gives

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}_n}\left\{|Q_n(\mathbf{X})-R_n(\mathbf{X})|>\frac{K\sqrt{n}+Cs\tanh(B)}{g(\theta)}\right\}\leq 2e^{-K^2/12}.$$

But then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}_n}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i>L_n\right\}=&\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}m_i(\mathbf{X})>\theta L_n\right\}\\ =&\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{Q_n(\mathbf{X})-R_n(\mathbf{X})>L_n\right\}\leq 2e^{-K^2/12},\end{aligned}$$

as

$$L_n\gg\frac{K\sqrt{n}+Cs\tanh(B)}{g(\theta)}.$$

This immediately yields the desired result.

5.4 Proof of Theorem 1

By Theorem 6, there is no asymptotically powerful test if $s\tanh(B)=O(n^{1/2})$. It now suffices to show that the naïve test is indeed asymptotically powerful. To this end, we first consider the Type I error. By Theorem 2 of Ellis and Newman (1978),

$$\sqrt{n}\bar{X}\to_d N\left(0,\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right),$$

which immediately implies that Type I error

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\mathbf{0}}\left(\sqrt{n}\bar{X}\geq L_n\right)\to 0.$$

Now consider Type II error. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{X} - f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tanh\left(\sum_{j\neq i} \mathbf{Q}_{ij} X_j + \mu_i\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X} + \mu_i - \theta X_i/n\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X} + \mu_i\right) + O(n^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that tanh is Lipschitz. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X} + \mu_i\right) &= \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X}\right) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \left[\tanh\left(\theta\bar{X} + \mu_i\right) - \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X}\right)\right] \\
&\geq \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X}\right) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \left[\tanh\left(\theta\bar{X} + B\right) - \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X}\right)\right] \\
&\geq \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X}\right) + \frac{s\tanh(B)}{n}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X}\right)\right] \\
&\geq \tanh\left(\theta\bar{X}\right) + \frac{s\tanh(B)}{n}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\theta\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{s\tanh(B)}{n}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\theta\right)\right] + O_p(n^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from (6). In other words,

$$\sqrt{n}\bar{X} - \sqrt{n} f_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{s\tanh(B)}{\sqrt{n}}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\theta\right)\right] + O_p(1).$$

Now an application of Lemma 1, together with the fact that $L_n = o(n^{-1/2} s\tanh(B))$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sqrt{n}\bar{X} \geq L_n\right) \to 1.$$

5.5 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of attainability follows immediately from Theorem 4. Therefore here we focus on the proof of the lower bound. As before, by the same argument as those following Section 5.2.1, it suffices to show that there does not exist a sequence of positive reals $\{L_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{0}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i > L_n\right) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i < L_n\right) \to 0.$$

From the proof of Lemma 1 and the inequality $|\tanh(x) - \tanh(y)| \leq |x - y|$, for any fixed $t < \infty$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \widetilde{\Xi}(s, B)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\Big(\bar{X} > \frac{s}{n}\tanh(\theta\bar{X} + B) + \frac{n-s}{n}\tanh(\theta\bar{X}) + \frac{\theta}{n} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) \leq 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{2na_n}},$$

where

$$a_n := \frac{2}{n} + \frac{2\theta}{n} + \frac{2\theta}{n^2}.$$

Also note that

$$\frac{s}{n}\tanh(\theta\bar{X} + B) + \frac{n-s}{n}\tanh(\theta\bar{X}) \leq \tanh(\theta\bar{X}) + C\frac{s}{n}\tanh(B),$$

for some constant $C < \infty$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\bar{X} - \tanh(\theta\bar{X}) > C\frac{s}{n}\tanh(B) + \frac{\theta}{n} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \leq 2\exp\left(-t^2/2na_n\right).$$

Since $s\tanh(B) = O(n^{1/2})$, we have

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\widetilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left\{\bar{X} - \tanh(\theta\bar{X}) > \frac{C(t)}{\sqrt{n}}\right\}) \leq 2\exp\left(-t^2/2na_n\right) \tag{20}$$

for some finite positive constant $C(t)$. Now, invoking Theorem 1 of Ellis and Newman (1978), under $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$ we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - m)|\bar{X} > 0 \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{1-m^2}{1-\theta(1-m^2)}\right),$$

where m is the unique positive root of $m = \tanh(\theta m)$. The same argument as that from Section 5.2.1 along with the requirement to control the Type I error then imply that without loss of generality one can assume the test ϕ_n rejects if $\bar{X} > m + L_n$, where $L_n \gg n^{-1/2}$.

Now, note that $g(x) = x - \tanh(\theta x)$ implies that $g'(x)$ is positive and increasing on the set $[m, \infty)$, and therefore

$$g(x) \geq g(m) + (x - m)g'(m).$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\bar{X} > m + L_n, \bar{X} - \tanh(\theta\bar{X}) \leq \frac{C(t)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\\ \leq&\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(\bar{X} > m + L_n, \bar{X} - m \leq \frac{C(t)}{g'(m)\sqrt{n}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

which is 0 for all large n, as $L_n \gg n^{-1/2}$. This, along with (20) gives

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\widetilde{\Xi}(s,B)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(1 - \phi_n) \geq 1,$$

thus concluding the proof.

5.6 Proof of Theorem 3

The proof of Theorem 3 is based on an auxiliary variable approach via Kac's Gaussian transform which we explain in the following discussion.In particular, the proof relies on the following two technical lemmas. The proof to both lemmas is relegated to the Appendix for brevity.

Lemma 3. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *follow a Curie-Weiss model of* (5) *with* $\theta > 0$. *Given* $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ *let* Z_n *be a normal random variable with mean* $\bar{x}$ *and variance* $1/(n\theta)$. *Then*

(a) Given $Z_n = z$ *the random variables* $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ *are mutually independent, with*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i = x_i) = \frac{e^{(\mu_i + z\theta)x_i}}{e^{\mu_i + z\theta} + e^{-\mu_i - z\theta}},$$

where $x_i \in \{-1, 1\}$.

(b) The marginal density of Z_n *is proportional to* $e^{-f_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z)}$, *where*

$$f_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z) := \frac{n\theta z^2}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\cosh(\theta z + \mu_i). \tag{21}$$

(c)

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in[0,\infty)^n} \mathbb{E}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i - \tanh(\mu_i + \theta Z_n))\Big)^2 \leq n.$$

While the previous lemma applies to all $\theta > 0$, the next one specializes to the case $\theta = 1$ and gives crucial estimates which will be used in proving Theorem 3.

For any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^n$ set

$$A(\boldsymbol{\mu}) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tanh(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i).$$

This can be thought of as the total amount of signal present in the parameter $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. In particular, note that for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Xi(s, B)$ we have

$$A(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \geq \frac{s\tanh(B)}{n},$$

and for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \tilde{\Xi}(s, B)$ we have

$$A(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \frac{s\tanh(B)}{n}.$$

In the following we abbreviate $s\tanh(B)/n := A_n$.

Lemma 4. *(a) If $\theta = 1$, for any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Xi(s, B)$ the function $f_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\cdot)$ defined by (21) is strictly convex, and has a unique global minimum $m_n \in (0, 1]$, such that*

$$m_n^3 = \Theta(A(\boldsymbol{\mu})). \tag{22}$$

(b)

$$\limsup_{K\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Z_n - m_n > Kn^{-1/4}) = 0.$$

(c) If $A_n \gg n^{-3/4}$ then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}: A(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \geq A_n} \mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\Big(Z_n \leq \delta m_n\Big) = 0.$$

We now come back to the proof of Theorem 3. To establish the upper bound, define a test function ϕ_n by $\phi_n(\mathbf{X}) =$ if $\bar{X} > 2\delta A_n^{1/3}$, and 0 otherwise, where δ is as in part (c) of Lemma 4. By Theorem 1 of Ellis and Newman (1978), under $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = 0$ we have

$$n^{1/4}\bar{X} \xrightarrow{d} Y, \tag{23}$$

where Y is a random variable on $\mathbb{R}$ with density proportional to $e^{-y^4/12}$. Since $A_n \gg n^{-3/4}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\mathbf{0}}(\bar{X} > 2\delta A_n^{1/3}) = o(1),$$

and so it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}: A(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \geq A_n} \mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\bar{X} \leq 2\delta A_n^{1/3}) = o(1). \tag{24}$$

To this effect, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n)) + n\tanh(Z_n)\end{aligned}$$

Now by Part (c) of Lemma 3 and Markov inequality,

$$|\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n))| \leq \delta n A_n^{1/3}$$

with probability converging to 1 uniformly over $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [0, \infty)^n$. Thus it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}: A(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \geq A_n} \mathbb{P}_{\theta, \boldsymbol{\mu}}(Z_n \leq 3\delta n A_n^{1/3}) = o(1).$$

But this follows on invoking Parts (a) and (c) of Lemma 4, and so the proof of the upper bound is complete.

To establish the lower bound, by the same argument as that from Section 5.2.1, it suffices to show that there does not exist a sequence of positive reals $\{L_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{0}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > L_n \right) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i < L_n \right) \to 0.$$

If $\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{1/4} L_n < \infty$, then (23) implies

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\theta, \mathbf{0}} \phi_n > 0,$$

and so we are done. Thus assume without loss of generality that $n^{1/4} L_n \to \infty$. In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(\mu_i) + n|Z_n|, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \left(\bar{X} > L_n \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \left\{ |\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \tanh(\mu_i + Z_n)| > L_n/3 \right\} + \mathbb{P}_{\theta, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \left\{ Z_n > L_n/3 \right\},$$

where we use the fact that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(\mu_i) = O(n^{1/4}) \ll L_n.$$

Now by Part (c) of Lemma 3 and Markov inequality, the first term above converges to 0 uniformly over all $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Also by Parts (a) and (b) of Lemma 4, the second term converges to 0 uniformly over all $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ such that $A(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = O(n^{-3/4})$. This completes the proof of the lower bound.

References

Louigi Addario-Berry, Nicolas Broutin, Luc Devroye, Gábor Lugosi, et al. On combinatorial testing problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(5):3063–3092, 2010.

Ery Arias-Castro and Meng Wang. The sparse poisson means model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9(2):2170–2201, 2015.

Ery Arias-Castro, David L Donoho, and Xiaoming Huo. Near-optimal detection of geometric objects by fast multiscale methods. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 51(7): 2402–2425, 2005.

Ery Arias-Castro, Emmanuel J Candès, Hannes Helgason, and Ofer Zeitouni. Searching for a trail of evidence in a maze. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1726–1757, 2008.

Ery Arias-Castro, Emmanuel J Candès, and Yaniv Plan. Global testing under sparse alternatives: Anova, multiple comparisons and the higher criticism. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2533–2556, 2011.

Bhaswar B Bhattacharya and Sumit Mukherjee. Inference in ising models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.07055*, 2015.

MV Burnashev. On the minimax detection of an inaccurately known signal in a white gaussian noise background. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 24(1):107–119, 1979.

T Tony Cai and Ming Yuan. Rate-optimal detection of very short signal segments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.2812*, 2014.

Sourav Chatterjee. Concentration inequalities with exchangeable pairs (phd thesis). *arXiv preprint math/0507526*, 2005.

Sourav Chatterjee. Steins method for concentration inequalities. *Probability theory and related fields*, 138(1):305–321, 2007.

Sourav Chatterjee, Partha S Dey, et al. Applications of steins method for concentration inequalities. *The Annals of Probability*, 38(6):2443–2485, 2010.

D. L. Donoho and J. Jin. Higher criticism for detecting sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(3):962–994, 2004.

Richard S. Ellis and Charles M. Newman. The statistics of curie-weiss models. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 19(2):149–161, 1978.

Geoffrey R Grimmett. *The random-cluster model*, volume 333. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

P. Hall and J. Jin. Innovated higher criticism for detecting sparse signals in correlated noise. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1686–1732, 2010.

Peter Hall and Jiashun Jin. Properties of higher criticism under strong dependence. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 381–402, 2008.

Y. I. Ingster. Minimax detection of a signal for l^n-balls. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 7(4):401–428, 1998.

Y. I. Ingster and I. A. Suslina. *Nonparametric goodness-of-fit testing under Gaussian models*, volume 169. Springer, 2003.

Yu I Ingster. Minimax detection of a signal in l_p metrics. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 68(4):503–515, 1994.

Yuri I Ingster, Alexandre B Tsybakov, and Nicolas Verzelen. Detection boundary in sparse regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 4:1476–1526, 2010.

Ernst Ising. Beitrag zur theorie des ferromagnetismus. *Zeitschrift für Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei*, 31(1):253–258, 1925.

Jiashun Jin and Tracy Ke. Rare and weak effects in large-scale inference: methods and phase diagrams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.4578*, 2014.

Mark Kac. Mathematical mechanisms of phase transitions. Technical report, Rockefeller Univ., New York, 1969.

Jacek Majewski, Hao Li, and Jurg Ott. The ising model in physics and statistical genetics. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 69(4):853–862, 2001.

Marc Mezard and Andrea Montanari. *Information, physics, and computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

Rajarshi Mukherjee, Natesh S Pillai, and Xihong Lin. Hypothesis testing for high-dimensional sparse binary regression. *The Annals of statistics*, 43(1):352, 2015.

Hidetoshi Nishimori. *Statistical physics of spin glasses and information processing: an introduction*. Number 111. Clarendon Press, 2001.

Lars Onsager. Crystal statistics. i. a two-dimensional model with an order-disorder transition. *Physical Review*, 65(3-4):117, 1944.

Dietrich Stauffer. Social applications of two-dimensional ising models. *American Journal of Physics*, 76(4):470–473, 2008.

Zheyang Wu, Yiming Sun, Shiquan He, Judy Cho, Hongyu Zhao, Jiashun Jin, et al. Detection boundary and higher criticism approach for rare and weak genetic effects. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 8(2):824–851, 2014.

Appendix – Proof of Auxiliary Results

Proof of Lemma 1. This is a standard application of Stein's Method for concentration inequalities (Chatterjee, 2005, 2007; Chatterjee et al., 2010). In particular, using notations from Lemma 1, the routine can be realized as follows.

One begins by noting that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(X_i|X_j, j\neq i\right)=\tanh\left(m_i\left(\mathbf{X}\right)+\mu_i\right),\quad m_i\left(\mathbf{X}\right):=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_j.$$

Now let $\mathbf{X}$ be drawn from (1) and let $\mathbf{X}^{'}$ is drawn by moving one step in the Glauber dynamics, i.e. first choose $I\sim U\left([n]\right)$ and replace the I^{th} coordinate of $\mathbf{X}$ by an element drawn from the conditional distribution of the I^{th} coordinate given the rest. It is not difficult to see that $(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{X}^{'})$ is an exchangeable pair of random vectors. Further define an anti-symmetric function $F:\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ as $F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_i-y_i\right)$, which ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\left(F(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{X}^{'})|\mathbf{X}\right)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}X_j-\tanh\left(m_j\left(\mathbf{X}\right)+\mu_j\right)=f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}).$$

Denoting $\mathbf{X}^i$ to be $\mathbf{X}$ with X_i replaced by $-X_i$, by Taylor's series we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tanh(m_j(\mathbf{X}^i)+\mu_j)-\tanh(m_j(\mathbf{X})+\mu_j)\\
=&(m_j(\mathbf{X}^i)-m_j(\mathbf{X}))g'(m_j(\mathbf{X}))+\frac{1}{2}(m_j(\mathbf{X}^i)-m_j(\mathbf{X}))^2g''(\xi_{ij})\\
=&-2\mathbf{Q}_{ij}X_ig'(m_j(\mathbf{X}))+2\mathbf{Q}_{ij}^2g''(\xi_{ij})
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\{\xi_{ij}\}_{1\le i,j\le n}$, where $g(t)=\tanh(t)$. Thus $f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X})-f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}^i)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X})-f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}^i)=&\frac{2X_i}{n}+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\Big\{\tanh\left(m_j\left(\mathbf{X}^i\right)+\mu_j\right)-\tanh\left(m_j\left(\mathbf{X}\right)+\mu_j\right)\Big\}\\
=&\frac{2X_i}{n}-\frac{2X_i}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\mathbf{Q}_{ij}g'(m_j(\mathbf{X}))+\frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\mathbf{Q}_{ij}^2g''(\xi_{ij})
\end{aligned}$$

Now using the method exchangeable pairs (see Lemma 1) and setting $p_i(\mathbf{X}):=\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i'=-X_i|X_k,k\neq i)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
v(\mathbf{X}):=&\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\Big(|f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X})-f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}')\|(X_I-X_I')|\Big|\mathbf{X}\Big)\\
=&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n|f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X})-f_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}^i)|X_ip_i(\mathbf{X})\\
\le&\frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^np_i(\mathbf{X})-\frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^n|\mathbf{Q}_{ij}p_i(\mathbf{X})g'(m_j(\mathbf{X}))|+\frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^n\mathbf{Q}_{ij}^2g''(\xi_{ij})^2X_ip_i(\mathbf{X})\\
\le&\frac{2}{n}+\frac{2}{n^2}\sup_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in[0,1]^n}|\mathbf{u}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}|+\frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^n\mathbf{Q}_{ij}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we use the fact that $\max(|g'(t)|,|g''(t)|)\le 1$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $\mathbf{Y}:=(Y_1,\cdots,Y_n)$ be i.i.d. random variables on $\{-1,1\}$ with $\mathbb{P}(Y_i=\pm1)=\frac{1}{2}$, and let $\mathbf{W}:=(W_1,\cdots,W_n)\overset{i.i.d.}{\sim}N(0,1)$. Also, for any $t>0$ let $Z(t\mathbf{Q},\mu)$ denote the normalizing constant of the p.m.f.

$$\frac{1}{Z(t\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu})}\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\top t\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\mathbf{x}\right)$$

Thus we have

$$2^{-n}Z(t\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu})=\mathbb{E}\exp\Big(\frac{t}{2}\mathbf{Y}^\top\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Y}+\sum_{i=1}^n\mu_iY_i\Big)\le\mathbb{E}\exp\Big(\frac{t}{2}\mathbf{W}^\top\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{W}+\sum_{i=1}^n\mu_iW_i\Big),$$

where we use the fact that $\mathbb{E}Y_i^k \leq \mathbb{E}W_i^k$ for all positive integers k. Using spectral decomposition write $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{P}$ and set $\nu := \mathbf{P}\boldsymbol{\mu}, \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{W}$ to note that

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\Big(\frac{t}{2}\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{W} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i W_i\Big) = \mathbb{E}\exp\Big(\frac{t}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \widetilde{W}_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \widetilde{W}_i\Big) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{\frac{\nu_i^2}{2(1-t\lambda_i)}}}{\sqrt{1-t\lambda_i}}.$$

Combining for any $t > 1$ we have the bounds

$$2^n \prod_{i=1}^n \cosh(\mu_i) = Z(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq Z(\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq Z(t\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq 2^n \frac{e^{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\nu_i^2}{2(1-t\lambda_i)}}}{\prod_{i=1}^n \sqrt{1-t\lambda_i}}, \tag{25}$$

where the lower bound follows from on noting that $\log Z(t\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ is monotone non-decreasing in t, using results about exponential families. Thus invoking convexity of the function $t \mapsto \log Z(t\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}} \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{X} = \frac{\partial \log Z(t\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu})}{\partial t}\Big|_{t=1} \leq & \frac{\log Z(t\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \log Z(\mathbf{Q}, \boldsymbol{\mu})}{t-1} \\ \leq & \sum_{i=1}^n \Big\{\frac{\nu_i^2}{2(1-t\lambda_i)} - \log\cosh(\mu_i)\Big\} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2}\log(1-t\lambda_i),\end{aligned}$$

where we use the bounds obtained in (25). Proceeding to bound the rightmost hand side above, set $t = \frac{1+\rho}{2\rho} > 1$ and note that

$$|t\lambda_i| \leq \frac{1+\rho}{2} < 1.$$

For $x \in \frac{1}{2}[-(1+\rho), (1+\rho)] \subset (-1, 1)$ there exists a constant $\gamma_\rho < \infty$ such that

$$\frac{1}{1-x} \leq 1 + x + 2\gamma_\rho x^2, \quad -\log(1-x) \leq x + 2\gamma_\rho x^2.$$

These, along with the observations that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = tr(\mathbf{Q}) = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i^2 = ||\mathbf{P}\boldsymbol{\mu}||^2 = ||\boldsymbol{\mu}||^2$$

give the bound

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma_\rho \sum_{i=1}^n \Big\{\frac{\nu_i^2}{2(1-t\lambda_i)} - \log\cosh(\mu_i)\Big\} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2}\log(1-t\lambda_i) \\ \leq & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i^2 + + \frac{t}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i^2\lambda_i + t^2\gamma_\rho \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i^2\lambda_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^4 + \gamma_\rho t^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \\ = & \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2 + \frac{t}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{Q}\boldsymbol{\mu} + t^2\gamma_\rho \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{Q}^2\boldsymbol{\mu} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^4 + \gamma_\rho t^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbf{Q}_{ij}^2 \\ \leq & \frac{1}{2}C\sqrt{n} + \frac{t}{2}C\rho\sqrt{n} + t^2\gamma_\rho C\rho^2\sqrt{n} + C\sqrt{n} + \gamma_\rho t^2 D\sqrt{n},\end{aligned}$$

where $D > 0$ is such that $\sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbf{Q}_{ij}^2 \leq D\sqrt{n}$. This along with (25) gives

$$\left[\frac{1}{2}C(1+t\rho) + t^2\gamma_\rho C\rho^2 + C + \gamma_\rho t^2 D\right]\sqrt{n} \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\mathbf{X}^\top\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{X} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i m_i(\mathbf{X})$$

But, for some random $(\xi_i, i = 1, \ldots, n)$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i m_i(\mathbf{X}) =& \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_i)m_i(\mathbf{X}) \\ =& \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))m_i(\mathbf{X}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i m_i(\mathbf{X})\operatorname{sech}^2(\xi_i).\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(m_i(\mathbf{X}))m_i(\mathbf{X}) \geq \frac{\eta}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n m_i(\mathbf{X})^2,$$

where

$$\eta := \inf_{|x|\leq 1}\frac{\tanh(x)}{x} > 0.$$

The desired conclusion of the lemma follows by noting that

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q},\boldsymbol{\mu}}\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i m_i(\mathbf{X})\operatorname{sech}^2(\xi_i)\right| \leq C\sqrt{n}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3. We begin with Part (a). By a simple algebra, the p.m.f. of $\mathbf{X}$ can be written as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) \propto \exp\left\{\frac{n\theta}{2}\bar{x}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\mu_i\right\}.$$

Consequently, the joint density of $(\mathbf{X}, Z_n)$ with respect to the product measure of counting measure on $\{-1, 1\}^n$ and Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ is proportional to

$$\begin{aligned}&\exp\left\{\frac{n\theta}{2}\bar{x}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\mu_i - \frac{n\theta}{2}(z-\bar{x})^2\right\} \\ =&\exp\left\{-\frac{n\theta}{2}z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i(\mu_i + z\theta)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Part (a) follows from the expression above.

Now consider Part (b). Using the joint density of Part (a), the marginal density of Z_n is proportional to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{-1,1\}^n}\exp\left\{-\frac{n\theta}{2}z^2+\sum_{i=1}^n x_i(\mu_i+z\theta)\right\}\\ =&\exp\left\{-\frac{n\theta}{2}z^2+\sum_{i=1}^n\log\cosh(\mu_i+z\theta)\right\}=e^{-f_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z)},\end{aligned}$$

thus completing the proof of Part (b).

Finally, consider Part (c). By Part (a) given $Z_n=z$ the random variables $(X_1,\cdots,X_n)$ are independent, with

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i=1|Z_n=z)=\frac{e^{\mu_i+\theta z}}{e^{\mu_i+\theta z}+e^{-\mu_i-\theta z}},$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i|Z_n=z)=\tanh(\mu_i+\theta z),\quad \mathsf{Var}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_i|Z_n=n)=\operatorname{sech}^2(\mu_i+\theta z).$$

Thus for any $\boldsymbol{\mu}\in[0,\infty)^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n(X_i-\tanh(\mu_i+\theta Z_n))\Big)^2=&\mathbb{E}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\mathbb{E}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n(X_i-\tanh(\mu_i+\theta Z_n))\Big)^2\Big|Z_n\Big\}\\ =&\mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^n\operatorname{sech}(\mu_i+\theta Z_n)^2\le n.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4. We begin with Part (a) Since

$$f''_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z)=\sum_{i=1}^n\tanh^2(z+\mu_i)$$

is strictly positive for all but at most one $z\in\mathbb{R}$, the function $z\mapsto f_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z)$ is strictly convex with $f_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\pm\infty)=\infty$, it follows that $z\mapsto f_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z)$ has a unique minima m_n which is the unique root of the equation $f'_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z)=0$. The fact that m_n is positive follows on noting that

$$f'_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(0)=-\sum_{i=1}^n\tanh(\mu_i)<0,\quad f'_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(+\infty)=\infty.$$

Also $f'_n(m_n)=0$ gives

$$m_n=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\tanh(m_n+\mu_i)\le 1,$$

and so $m_n \in (0,1]$. Finally, $f'_{n,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(m_n) = 0$ can be written as

$$m_n - \tanh(m_n) = \frac{s}{n}\Big[\tanh(m_n + B) - \tanh(m_n)\Big] \geq C\frac{s}{n}\tanh(B),$$

for some $C > 0$, which proves Part (a).

Now consider Part (b). By a Taylor's series expansion around m_n and using the fact that $f''_n(z)$ is strictly increasing on $(0,\infty)$ gives

$$f_n(z) \geq f_n(m_n) + \frac{1}{2}(z-m_n)^2 f''_n(m_n + Kn^{-1/4}) \text{ for all } z \in [m_n + Kn^{-1/4}, \infty)$$
$$f_n(z) \leq f_n(m_n) + \frac{1}{2}(z-m_n)^2 f''_n(m_n + Kn^{-1/4}) \text{ for all } z \in [m_n, m_n + Kn^{-1/4}].$$

Setting $b_n := f''_n(m_n + Kn^{-1/4})$ this gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Z_n > m_n + Kn^{-1/4}) \\
=&\frac{\int_{m_n+Kn^{-1/4}} e^{-f_n(z)}dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-f_n(z)}dz} \\
\leq&\frac{\int_{m_n+Kn^{-1/4}}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{b_n}{2}(z-m_n)^2}dz}{\int_{m_n}^{m_n+Kn^{-1/4}} e^{-\frac{b_n}{2}(z-m_n)^2}dz} \\
=&\frac{\mathbb{P}(N(0,1) > Kn^{-1/4}\sqrt{b_n})}{\mathbb{P}(0 < N(0,1) < Kn^{-1/4}\sqrt{b_n})},
\end{aligned}$$

from which the desired conclusion will follow if we can show that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{-1/2}b_n > 0$. But this follows on noting that

$$n^{-1/2}b_n = n^{-1/2}f''_n(m_n + Kn^{-1/4})) \geq \sqrt{n}\tanh^2(Kn^{-1/4}) = K^2\Theta(1).$$

Finally, let us prove Part (c). By a Taylor's series expansion about δm_n and using the fact that $f_n(\cdot)$ is convex with unique global minima at m_n we have

$$f_n(z) \geq f_n(m_n) + (z - \delta m_n)f'_n(\delta m_n), \quad \forall z \in (-\infty, \delta m_n].$$

Also, as before we have

$$f_n(z) \leq f_n(m_n) + \frac{1}{2}(z-m_n)^2 f''_n(m_n), \forall z \in [m_n, 2m_n]$$

Thus with $c_n := f_n''(2m_n)$ for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\theta,\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Z_n \le \delta m_n) =& \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\delta m_n} e^{-f_n(z)} dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-f_n(z)} dz} \\ \le& \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\delta m_n} e^{-(z-\delta m_n) f_n'(\delta m_n)} dz}{\int_{m_n}^{2m_n} e^{-\frac{c_n}{2}(z-m_n)^2} dz} \\ =& \frac{\sqrt{2\pi c_n}}{|f_n'(\delta m_n)| \mathbb{P}(0 < Z < m_n\sqrt{c_n})}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

To bound the the rightmost hand side of (26), we claim that the following estimates hold:

$$c_n = \Theta(n m_n^2), \tag{27}$$

$$|f_n'(\delta m_n)| \ge \Theta(n m_n^3). \tag{28}$$

Given these two estimates, we immediately have

$$m_n\sqrt{c_n} = \Theta(m_n^2\sqrt{n}) \ge \Theta(A_n^{2/3}\sqrt{n}) \to \infty, \tag{29}$$

as $A_n \gg n^{-3/4}$ by assumption. Thus the rightmost hand side of (26) can be bounded by

$$\frac{m_n\sqrt{n}}{n m_n^3} = \Theta\Big(\frac{1}{m_n^2\sqrt{n}}\Big) \to 0,$$

where the last conclusion uses (29). This completes the proof of Part (c).

It thus remains to prove the estimates (27) and (28). To this effect, note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_n''(2m_n) =& \sum_{i=1}^n \tanh^2(2m_n + \mu_i) \\ \le& \sum_{i=1}^n \Big(\tanh(2m_n) + C_2(2)\tanh(\mu_i)\Big)^2 \\ \le& 2n\tanh^2(2m_n) + 2C_2(2)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \tanh^2(\mu_i) \\ \lesssim& n m_n^2 + nA(\mu_n) \lesssim n m_n^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses part (a). This proves (27). Turning to prove (28) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n'(\delta m_n)| =& \sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(\delta m_n + \mu_i) - n\delta m_n \\ =& \Big[\sum_{i=1}^n \tanh(\delta m_n + \mu_i) - \tan(\delta m_n)\Big] - n[\delta m_n - \tanh(\delta m_n)] \\ \ge& C_1(1) nA(\mu_n) - C_3\delta^3 m_n^3 \\ \gtrsim& n m_n^3, \end{aligned}$$

where δ is chosen small enough. This completes the proof of (28), and hence completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$